

in America (1775-1783). She was born in Franklin County, Pennsylvania. In 1756, Indians killed her father and captured her mother. An uncle raised her.

In 1775, Margaret's husband, John Corbin, enlisted in the Continental Army, and he served as a gunner in the Revolutionary War. Like many other soldiers' wives at the time, Margaret joined her husband in camp to cook, wash, and do other chores for the troops. At Fort Washington, on the site of present-day New York City, John Corbin was killed. Margaret replaced him at his cannon and fought until she was seriously wounded.

Corbin's wounds left her disabled. In 1779, the Continental Congress awarded her a military pension, making her one of the first women in the United States to receive such aid. Corbin is buried in the military cemetery at West Point, N.Y.

Madam Speaker, I also would like to refer Mr. Limbaugh to many other things. First of all, the mini page which is in most newspapers in America. The Mini Page came out last year and had a very, very extensive thing about women in the military through the years. I am very sorry he did not read this. I would hope he would try and get it from the library. But it pointed out there have been American women in the military, through today, the Revolutionary War and the Civil War. He might find this interesting reading.

I would also point out that there is a 1996 calendar, as there have been others, done by women veterans, and this is pointed out through the years of all the different women throughout here. There is one for each month. Again, this might be a very good thing for his office. It might inform him that women did indeed contribute to this country.

Now, there are other things that I would like to recommend he look at. There is a coloring book from the National Women's Hall of Fame, and maybe this would be simple enough. It could be a beginning point for him. He could start with this to find out that indeed there have been some women who have done some things.

If he can get through that, then there is a little more detailed book that lists all sorts of women, where they were from, when they were born, what they accomplished, women scientists, women in the military, women aviators, women everything. It would absolutely break his little heart, and so I hope he works through that.

Now, if he really gets to the big time, there is a little bit bigger book here that points out even more things about women in American history that I think are terribly, terribly important.

I guess the real thing that we would like to point out to Mr. Limbaugh, the gentleman that they have called the big, fat idiot, I would like to quote to him from Clara Barton. Clara Barton said, "From the storm lashed decks of the *Mayflower* to the present hour women have stood like a rock for the welfare of this country."

They have, and it is time we recognize it, and that is what we are trying to do. Rush Limbaugh, tune in.

CALLING ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO CONDUCT ITS RELATIONS WITH TAIWAN BY PEACEFUL MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COX of California. Madam Speaker, just in reply to the remarks of my colleague from Colorado I have to say I agree completely, that women have been leaders in every field of human endeavor, including conservative politics, and for that reason there are women all over America who cheerfully disagree with the gentlewoman from Colorado on many subjects.

Let me talk about something that I think all of us here in the House can agree with, and that is the importance of a united U.S. foreign policy in Asia at this moment.

In just 2 weeks Taiwan will have its first direct presidential election, the first fully free and democratic election of a head of state in nearly 5,000 years, in 4,700 years, of Chinese civilization. This is a remarkable achievement, and Americans should be enormously proud of Taiwan's democracy. The thriving democracy on Taiwan stands in marked contrast to the continuation of communism across the Taiwan Strait and the People's Republic of China.

Madam Speaker, Taiwan is America's seventh largest trading partner. The People's Republic of China is the sixth largest trading partner of America, and yet the People's Republic of China has 250 times the territory of Taiwan, it has 60 times its population. Consider then that Taiwan, and its people, and its economy actually buy more goods and services from America than does the People's Republic of China. The People's Republic of China is our sixth largest trading partner as compared to Taiwan, our seventh, only because they have an enormous trade deficit, in fact the largest in the world, with us.

We have, from a trade standpoint, a very strong interest in being friendly to both the People's Republic of China and to Taiwan. But because the Communist government in Beijing believes that democracy on Taiwan threatens its continued existence, they have been intimidating, through military brute force, the voters on Taiwan.

Today the People's Republic of China began launching missiles over the Taiwan Strait. It will do so, we are told, for 8 days, between now and March 15, in particular in 2 target areas 20 miles east of Keelung, a port city in the northeastern part of Taiwan, and 30 miles west of Kaohsiung, a port city in the southwestern part of Taiwan.

I want to underscore as we meet here tonight that Communist China has already begun firing these missiles.

Over 70 percent of commercial shipping enters Taiwan through these two port cities that I mentioned. Already military actions undertaken by the Communist government in Beijing have amounted effectively to a partial

blockade of Taiwan. They have disrupted already commercial shipping in the Taiwan Strait. They have even disrupted airline traffic which has had to be rerouted around the island.

This is not the first time in the runup to these elections that Communist China has sought to intimidate freedom and democracy in Taiwan. The People's Republic of China has conducted large scale military maneuvers to intimidate Taiwan before its legislative elections in December. The latest round of intimidation, just recently, includes amassing 150,000 Chinese troops and 220 fighter aircraft just miles from Taiwan. And China, when the People's Republic of China sought to intimidate voters as they went to legislative elections, they fired nuclear capable missiles about 100 miles north of Taiwan last July.

The People's Republic of China has officially and unofficially told the United States that they have developed plans for a 30-day missile attack of Taiwan. People's Republic of China officials told former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asia, Chas Freeman, that they have developed such plans. They told a Stanford scholar, John Lewis, who is close our Defense Secretary Perry, that they have developed plans for a sustained 30-day missile assault on Taiwan. These same military leaders have even made a thinly veiled threat against the United States, communicating again with Chas Freeman, that they might attack the United State with nuclear weapons should we concern ourselves with the preservation of democracy and freedom on Taiwan in the face of a Communist Chinese military assault.

Madam Speaker, it is outrageous that Communist China is planning and threatening a military invasion of Taiwan. Nothing in law or nature gives the communists the right to launch a military attack on millions of innocent civilians there. It is doubly outrageous that they are doing so to intimidate democracy, and for this reason today a bipartisan group of House Members has introduced a resolution. It is numbered House Concurrent Resolution 148.

I just note that it is House Concurrent Resolution 148, sponsored by every Member of the House leadership and bipartisan leaders, particularly of the Human Rights Caucus, the Democratic and Republican membership of the House of Representatives, and I urge all of my colleagues to sponsor this very important resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GEJDENSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. TOWNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

INTRODUCTION OF THE CHRISTOPHER REEVE HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, today I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, H.R. 3030, and it is entitled the Christopher Reeve Health Insurance Reform Act. I think that that name, rather than the number 3030, is a name that Americans know and respect. Christopher Reeve is an accomplished actor, someone that has appeared both on stage and screen in our Nation and, I believe, now is playing one of the great roles of his life as he advocates for the reforms that are necessary to our health system. And so I am very pleased that he would lend his name to this piece of legislation that seeks to reform a very, very important part of our health insurance system in our country.

□ 1930

What this bill would do would be to lift the lifetime cap limit that exists in health insurance policies today. People that own life insurance policies may not be, and most are not, aware of the fine print that exists within that policy.

Back in the 1970's, a \$1 million cap was placed on the usage or the ceiling for health insurance policies. One million dollars in 1970 was a lot of money. Today \$1 million, when a catastrophic incident happens in an individual's life, as it did and came into Christopher Reeves' life, \$1 million will be used up very, very quickly. So I think it is important that that standard lifetime cap on individual health insurance policies be raised. That is what this bill accomplishes.

Specifically, the legislation would prohibit insurers from placing limits on health insurance policies of less than \$10 million, so those that insure themselves, their policy would have a ceiling of not \$1 million, but \$10 million. I think this is an important and necessary reform measure that needs to be accomplished.

Last year, Madam Speaker, in our great Nation, 1,500 individuals exhausted their lifetime caps under their health insurance plans. Price Waterhouse estimates that between 1995 and the year 2000, an additional 10,000 Americans will reach their lifetime caps because they require continual medical care. This legislation will protect frequent users of health insurance from being stranded, because a \$10 million limit better reflects today's medical inflation.

The \$1 million cap, as I said, was adopted in the early 1970's. That reflected very much the times. But that

has never been adjusted with inflationary figures, and we know if there is anything that has inflated, that is the cost of health care. Lifting the lifetime caps. Madam Speaker, would also save the Federal Government money.

Price Waterhouse estimates that removing lifetime caps would save the Medicaid Program \$7 billion over 5 years. The American Academy of Actuaries estimates that lifting the lifetime caps will cause only a slight increase in premiums, about 1 percent to 2 percent, for employers. I think we can all agree that the \$1 million lifetime cap is something that has outlived itself. That is to say that it does not fit with the times. This bill, H.R. 3030, will accomplish that.

Let me close, Madam Speaker, by paying tribute to Christopher Reeves. As I said earlier, he is a recognized name by Americans because of how he distinguished himself on stage and screen. He has been a great advocate for the arts and the humanities, and now, today, he is moving into a new role, and that is being an advocate for the necessary, important reforms that we can bring to the health care system. His eloquent voice, I hope, will be matched by the eloquent act of this Congress.

That is what I urge my colleagues to support and to cosponsor, so we can correct this in the law, and recognize that Americans will be helped, and that with that, we help move America forward. I salute Christopher Reeves for his courage, and I hope Members of Congress will try to match what he has exhibited by supporting this legislation, and indeed, making it the law.

IT IS THE ECONOMY THAT IS A PRIORITY TO MOST AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, after two Government shutdowns and a near default on our obligations, today this House has passed a short-term bill to raise the debt ceiling and to pass a continuing resolution for the work we have not done on four major appropriation bills, bills that contain important funding for domestic programs.

It is important that America pay its bills and meet its obligations. It is also important that we do all that we can to keep the Government running. We do not need a third Government shutdown, but we are now almost halfway through the fiscal year and we have done nothing to bring relief from the daily struggles to make ends meet for working families of America.

Today, once again, the continuing resolution cuts education funding. We want to lead the world in education, but we do not want to provide the resources to do so. Because of what Congress did today, there will be fewer teachers, more crowded classrooms, less money for equipment and supplies,

and not as much help for those who need a healthy start or a head start.

The answer Congress has been giving to the working families who are working just as hard as ever before is that inflation is low, economic indicators are good, the stock market is rallying, and jobs are on the rise. All of that means nothing to the unemployed father or to the single mother or to the family of four with children in college, or to senior citizens who are now being told their lifetime work has no value.

The fact of the matter is that the quality of life for most Americans is not getting better. The fact of the matter is that most of our citizens have little confidence in the economy, and less confidence in government. The fact of the matter is that while Congress is fighting over balanced budgets and spending limits, the public is losing faith in the American dream. The reason the public is losing faith is because more people have less money, while less people have more money. The rich are getting richer and the working families are suffering more of the losses that we are suffering.

It is by now widely known that the income gap between those with a lot of money and those without much money is growing faster, and is very troubling. This Congress must not ignore these harsh realities, and heed the cries for help coming from all quarters of working America.

It should concern us that the industries that have led this Nation over the last 5 years in job production are temporary employment agencies. It should claim our immediate attention that bankruptcies are skyrocketing and bad credit is more and more common.

What can we do to restore faith in our economy and our Government and recapture the American dream? What can we do to bring some relief to our citizens? We can start by passing the modest minimum wage increase bill that has been languishing in Congress for months and months now. We can go further by treating ordinary citizens with respect and the care with which we treat corporate America. We can do it best by passing a fair tax reform legislation aimed at working Americans and not always only at wealthy Americans. We can move America forward by ensuring quality health care, especially for our seniors, by protecting our environment and preserving education.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, college graduates earn 24 percent more than workers with high school degrees. Why, then, are we cutting education and claiming these cuts are necessary for progress?

High-wage jobs are needed to close the income gap. High-wage jobs require more education, not less education. Why do we think China and Japan and other countries in Asia and other parts of the world are concentrating on sending their young people to America to get educated? They know what Congress seems to ignore, that the key to a better quality of life is through our schoolhouse doors.